



City of Seattle
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Bernie Agor Matsuno, Director



King County



HARBORVIEW MEDICAL CENTER MAJOR INSTITUTIONS STANDING CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Harborview Medical
Center Major Institutions
Standing Citizens
Advisory Committee**

Members

Larry Brouse – Chair
Kristin O'Donnell
John Dolan
Frederick Scheetz
Anne Fiske Zuniga
S Anne Newcombe
Leslie Harper Miles
Mike Greene
Kristen Johnson
Ted Klainer

Ex-Officio Members

Steve Sheppard – DON
Michael Dorcy – DPD
Elise Chayet – Harborview
Medical Center

MINUTES

Meeting #30

Tuesday, August 28, 2012

Members Present

Larry Brouse	Anne Newcombe
Frederick Scheetz	John Dolan
Leslie Harper Miles	Anne Fiske Zuniga

Members Absent

Ted Klainer	Mike Greene
Kristen Johnson	Kristin O'Donnell

Staff Present

Steve Sheppard – City of Seattle, Department of Neighborhoods
Elise Chayet – Associate Administrator, Harborview
Michael Dorcy – City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development

Others Present

(see sign-in sheet)

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Larry Brouse. Brief introductions followed.

Steve Sheppard provided members copies of those portions of the Major Institutions Code Section 23.69.035 that dealt with changes or amendments to an Adopted Major Institutions Mater Plan. He noted that the County, and Harborview, s "owners" of the overlay zone are doing their due diligence to determine whether they're going to go forward with a possible redevelopment of Harborview Hall. He noted that if they go forward an amendment might be needed and that in that case an interpretation from the City, as to whether a major or minor amendment to the plan would be required. He noted that an amendment has not come been proposed at this point. Until such a request is made the City operates under the current plan. He noted tht any motion concerning the amendment issue would be a preliminary indication of the sense of the Committee at this time. Only once a formal request is made can you take a formal action concerning your recommendation.



2. Proposed Resolution and letter from CAC

Larry Brouse stated that the purpose of this meeting is consider a vote on a resolution that was introduced at our last meeting but it was not acted on as there was not a sufficient quorum. John Dolan has requested that we adopt a resolution. John Dolan stated that he had further refined and revised the motion that he had proposed at meeting 29. He then moved:

Whereas, the contract for demolition of Harborview Hall was allowed to lapse thereby stopping the development of the Major Institutions Master Plans approved center campus open space park; and

Whereas, King County at the direction of King County Executive Dow Constantine has proposed the retention, renovation, seismic buttressing and expansion of Harborview Hall in place of the open space;

Therefore, we the member of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Harborview Medical Center feel that the proposal for Harborview Hall by the King County Executive constitutes a major amendment to the approved Harborview Medical Center Major Institution Master Plan in that it:

1. retains a building specifically designated for demolition;
2. adds approximately 70,000 square feet of new construction;
3. eliminates a centrally located open space which was a critical design element of the approved Master Plan;
4. changes the orientation of the open space from centrally located on Ninth Avenue to peripherally located on Terry Avenue.

These are inconsistent with the original intent of the adopted Master Plan. We request that the governing MIMP process to address such a major amendment begin immediately.

We also wish to express that we are not in favor of the proposal to retain Harborview Hall and urge that the approved master plan be adhered to and completed in an expeditious manner.

The motion was seconded by Fred Scheetz. Discussion followed.

There was a question regarding bullet #2 regarding the new construction of 70,000 square feet triggering a major amendment to the master plan on its own. Steve responded that simply adding additional square footage would not trigger an amendment as the existing plan still has available authorized square footage. Others noted that the amount of square footage added in the various alternative's varied between 40,000 and 70,000 square feet.

Members asked if the retention of the existing building itself would likely constitute a major amendment. Mr. Sheppard responded that the plan held out the option of

building on that site, so that it would appear unlikely that the retention of the building itself would trigger a major amendment. He noted that in any case that would be the subject of an interpretation by DPD which would come to the committee at a later date. Mr. Sheppard further stating that if you take each of the bullets alone they would not on the surface appear to be necessarily trigger a major amendment. Location of the open space might need to be looked at carefully when this comes to the City. However, he noted that the code states that a change the location and the amount of open space may be considered a minor amendment..

Members asked, what effect this motion would have. Michael Dorcy, ex-officio member from the City Department of Planning and Development, stated that this would not be considered a formal recommendation concerning any amendment interpretation. That recommendation would can only occur once there's an actual application on the table.

Steve Sheppard asked if it was Mr. Dolans intention that this be directed primarily to the County at this point. Mr. Dolan responded that his intention was to direct this to all County Council members, City Council members, the County Executive, and the Mayor's Office and others to indicate our present position. He acknowledged that a formal final position would happen later.

Larry Brouse stated that he thought the intent of the motion was let the County Council know that the SAC remains opposed to the project. We're not opposed to the design presented per se as an alternative. What we're opposed to is the underlying assumption that the building should be retained. He stated that in my opinion the Heart of Campus open space remains critical to the whole design concept of the master plan.

Members noted that the last paragraph of the proposed resolution seems better suited in the cover letter that transmits it than in the resolution itself. The CAC is asking that the review process to determine whether this would be a major or minor amendment start immediately. John Dolan stated that the intention is to do just that and agreed to removal of the last paragraph as a friendly amendment. John Dolan stated that some of his concern is how this came about. He noted that many perceive that this is a fast moving train and there's nothing to stop it if we don't somehow raise a flag. He also noted that he had added a fifth point "Is inconsistent with the original intent of the adopted Master Plan".

Larry Brouse asked for any more questions, comments, discussion. No further questions or discussion being forthcoming, Mr. Sheppard re-read the motion as amended.

Whereas:

The contract for demolition of Harborview Hall was allowed to lapse thereby stopping the development of the Major Institutions Master Plans approved center campus open space park; and

Whereas:

King County at the direction of King County Executive Dow Constantine has proposed the retention, renovation, seismic buttressing and expansion of Harborview Hall in place of the Open Space;

Therefore:

We the member of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Harborview Medical Center feel that the proposal for Harborview Hall by the King County Executive constitutes a major amendment to the approved Harborview Medical Center Major Institution Master Plan in that it:

- Retains a building specifically designated for demolition;
- Adds approximately 70,000 square feet of new construction;
- Eliminates a centrally located open space which was a critical design element of the approved Master Plan;
- Changes the orientation of the open space from centrally located on Ninth Avenue to peripherally located on Terry Avenue.
- Is inconsistent with the original intent of the adopted Master Plan

We request that the governing MIMP process to address such a major amendment begin immediately.

The motion was called by show of hands.

The vote was:

Yea	5
Nay	0
Abstaining	0

A quorum being present and the majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

3. Next Steps

Mr. Dolan noted that he would draft a cover letter to accompany the resolution passed at this meeting and circulate it for member's approval.

4. Adjournment.

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.